



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,698	08/05/2003	Donald E. Marigliano	17209-345	7559
54205 7590 07/20/2010 CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				
EXAMINER LEMIEUX, JESSICA				
ART UNIT 3693		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 07/20/2010		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/634,698

**Applicant(s)**

MARIGLIANO, DONALD E.

**Examiner**

JESSICA L. LEMIEUX

**Art Unit**

3693

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 19-24, 27-29, 32-34 and 37-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 19-24, 27-29, 32-34 and 37-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Final Office action is in response to the application filed on August 5<sup>th</sup>, 2003 and in response to the applicant's arguments/amendments filed on May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2010. Claims 15, 19-24, 27-29, 32-34 and 37-41 are pending.

### **Response to Arguments**

2. Applicant states that the prior art doesn't disclose "wherein each multiple simultaneous option order is individually configurable as a buy or sell." Examiner notes that these arguments are made with respect to the amended claims. Examiner disagrees with the applicant's conclusion that the pending claims as amended are in condition for allowance, as the amended claims have been considered but applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. In response to the second argument, the Examiner respectfully reiterates that Ram discloses using color indicators for differentiating types of order data (short/option/margin/profit/loss/etc.) (paragraphs [0060 & 0235]) although Ram does not specifically teach determining a color based on a difference between a strike price of an option quote and a price of a security underlying the presented option quote and presenting the option quote in association with the color. It should also further be noted that the difference between the underlying security's current market price and the option's strike price represents the amount of profit per share gained upon the exercise or the sale of the option. Therefore, since Ram teaches using color indicators for differentiating types of order data (profit/loss), it can be reasonably ascertained that Ram teaches representing a difference between a strike price of an option quote and a

price of a security underlying the presented option quote and presenting the option quote in association with the color (profit/loss). Berckmans further discloses that voluminous information displayed textually is easily confused and misinterpreted and that by representing financial data using colors users can more easily and quickly perceive and process displayed information (page 6, lines 16-22). Examiner noted that this could be easily adapted to determine a color based on a difference between a strike price of an option quote and a price of a security underlying the presented option quote and present the option quote in association with the color and the combination of Ram and Berckmans would simplify the perception and processing of displayed financial data. Official notice was taken simply to overcome the fact that neither Ram nor Berckmans specifically taught a plurality of brightness levels of color to associate the difference with. Examiner asserted that it is old and well known to determine a brightness level of color for ease of perception and processing of displayed information. The evidence to support this assertion is that humans perceive different shades/brightness levels of colors as separate "colors" all together (lime green vs. hunter green, sky blue vs. navy blue, etc.). Examiner notes that different brightness levels of colors are thus perceived as different "colors" all together and by incorporating different brightness levels of colors it would further increase the complexity of perceptible information available visually, as addressed by Ram and Berckmans. Therefore the combination of Ram in view of Berckmans further in view of Official Notice teaches associating a plurality of brightness levels determined based on the difference

between a strike price of the presented option quote and a price of a security underlying the presented option quotes.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 15, 19-21, 24, 27-29, 32-34 and 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Number 2003/0004853 to Ram et. al (hereinafter Ram) in view of US Patent Application 2002/0152153 to Nakagawa (hereinafter Nakagawa) and US Patent 7,529,701 to Shields et al. (hereinafter Shields) further in view of US Patent Application US2002/0194110 to Young (hereinafter Young).

As per claims 15, 24, 29, and 34

Ram discloses a processor and a storage device in communication with said processor and storing instructions adapted to be executed by said processor (page 1, paragraph [0009] and page 9, paragraph [0182]), and an option (page 2, paragraph [0028]) server for receiving option quote information and for transmitting option quote information and a client device in communication with the option server (page 9, paragraph [0178]), for

Presenting a graphical user interface, the graphical user interface comprising at least one option quote area for presenting a plurality of option quotes and an order entry area comprising input areas for inputting two or more option orders selected from the presented plurality of option quotes; and (Figure 12: 124 & 128, Figure 16 and Figure 51);

Receiving via a processor a user selection of one of the presented plurality of option quotes for order placement, automatically populating at least one of the input areas of the order entry area with attributes of first and subsequent option orders corresponding to user-selected option quotes prior to simultaneous order placement and iteratively receiving a user selection and automatically populating the option order

input area until the submit user control is activated (Level I data) (page 3, paragraphs [0042-0043] and Figure 12: 124 & 128, Figure 16 and Figure 51).

Examiner notes that selecting a security could be done by typing or rather inputting the security symbol into the tab set 128. Examiner further notes that applicant is correct in saying that a display at a trader's location will display data for a selected security and the displayed data will be displayed in a tab set, however examiner further asserts that this information is not solely in tabs 120 or 124 but also in tab 128. Therefore, by selecting a security data is populated (value/bid/ask/last/change/high/low, etc.) that facilitates the ordering of securities. Finally examiner asserts that Ram (Figure 12: 128) thus does disclose displaying a plurality of data and populating data in an appropriate input area of an order entry area.

Ram does not specifically teach placing the selected option orders simultaneously and a submit user control to facilitate simultaneously placing multiple option orders.

Nakagawa teaches placing the selected option orders simultaneously and a submit user control to facilitate simultaneously placing multiple option orders (abstract, Figure 2, paragraphs [0014, 0015, 0018, 0031]).

Shields teaches placing the selected option orders simultaneously and a submit user control to facilitate simultaneously placing multiple option orders (see at least Figure 10).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Ram to include placing the selected option orders simultaneously and a submit user control to facilitate simultaneously placing multiple option orders as taught by Nakagawa and Shields to use known technique to improve similar art in the same way to accommodate users who wish to submit multiple option orders at the same time.

Ram, Nakagawa and Shields do not specifically teach wherein each multiple simultaneous option order is individually configurable as a buy or sell.

Young teaches wherein each multiple simultaneous option order is individually configurable as a buy or sell (Figure, paragraph [0004]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Ram, Nakagawa and Shields to include wherein each multiple simultaneous option order is individually configurable as a buy or sell as taught by Young to combine prior art elements according to known methods to include combining buy and sell orders into a multiple option order.

As per claim 19

Ram discloses receiving numbers of option quotes to present in the presented option quote areas and presenting option quotes in the presented option quote areas based on the numbers received for the corresponding option quote areas (page 9, paragraph [0178], lines 1-8).

As per claims 20, 27, 32 and 37

Ram discloses receiving strike prices above and/or below a particular strike price for which option quotes are presented in option quote areas and presenting option quotes associated with the strike prices above and/or below the particular strike price in option quote areas (Figure 46: 344a-f & page 16, paragraph [0291]).

As per claims 21, 28 and 33

Ram discloses the particular strike price is equal to a current price of a security underlying the option (page 16, paragraph [0291], lines 9-11). Examiner notes that since the strike price is user configurable, the strike can be easily adjusted to equate the current price.

As per claim 38, 39, 40 and 41

Ram discloses presenting in the graphical user interface attributes of the plurality of presented option quotes (Figure 12: 124 & 128, Figure 16 and Figure 51).

5. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication Number 2003/0004853 to Ram et. al (hereinafter Ram) in view of US Patent Application 2002/0152153 to Nakagawa (hereinafter Nakagawa) and US Patent 7,529,701 to Shields et al. (hereinafter Shields) in view of US Patent Application US2002/0194110 to Young (hereinafter Young) in view of US Patent Number 6,876,981 to Berckmans (hereinafter Berckmans) further in view of Official Notice.

As per claim 22

Ram discloses using color indicators for differentiating types of order data (page 4, paragraph [0060] and page 13, paragraph [0235]). Ram discloses using color indicators for differentiating types of order data (short/option/margin/profit/loss/etc.) (paragraphs [0060 & 0235]).

Ram does not specifically teach determining a color based on a difference between a strike price of an option quote and a price of a security underlying the presented option quote and presenting the option quote in association with the color.

Examiner notes that Moneyness is a term that is obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention describing the relationship between the strike price of an option and the current trading price of its underlying security. Where settlement is financial, the difference between the strike price and the spot price will determine the value, or "moneyness" of the contract. Examiner further notes that in finance, moneyness is

typically viewed as a measure of the degree to which a derivative security is likely to have positive monetary value at its expiration.

Berckmans discloses that voluminous information displayed textually is easily confused and misinterpreted and that by representing financial data using colors users can more easily and quickly perceive and process displayed information (page 6, lines 16- 22). Examiner notes that since Ram teaches using color indicators for differentiating types of order data (profit/loss/etc.) and moneyness is typically viewed as a measure of the degree to which a derivative security is likely to have positive monetary value at its expiration, a profit indicator it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to determine a color based on a difference between a strike price of an option quote and a price of a security underlying the presented option quote and present the option quote in association with the color.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to determine a color based on a difference between a strike price of an option quote and a price of a security underlying the presented option quote and present the option quote in association with the color as taught by Ram and Berckmans to simplify the perception and processing of displayed financial data.

The combination of Ram and Berckmans does not specifically teach a plurality of brightness levels of a color.

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known within the art to determine a brightness level of color for ease of perception and processing of displayed information. Humans perceive different shades/brightness levels of colors as separate "colors" all together (lime green vs. hunter green, sky blue vs. navy blue, etc.). Examiner notes that different brightness levels of colors are thus perceived as different "colors" all together.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the color based financial visual data of the combination of Ram and Berckmans to include a plurality of brightness levels of color to add a complexity of perceptible information available visually.

As per claim 23

Ram discloses using color indicators for differentiating types of order data (short/option/margin/profit/loss/etc.) (page 4, paragraph [0060] and page 13, paragraph [0235]). Ram also discloses determining an option exchange (NASDAQ) associated with an option quote (page 11, paragraph [0204]).

Ram does not specifically teach determining a color associated with the option exchange and presenting the option quote in association with the color.

Berckmans discloses that voluminous information displayed textually is easily confused and misinterpreted and that by representing financial data using colors users can more easily and quickly perceive and process displayed information (page 6, lines 16- 22). Examiner notes that this could be easily adapted to determine a color associated with the option exchange and present the option quote in association with the color.



Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to determine a color associated with the option exchange and present the option quote in association with the color as taught by Berckmans to simplify the perception and processing of displayed financial data.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **JESSICA L. LEMIEUX** whose telephone number is (571)270-3445. The examiner can normally be reached on **Monday-Thursday 8AM-5PM**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Kramer can be reached on 571-272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James A. Kramer/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3693

Jessica L Lemieux  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3693

/J. L. L./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3693  
July 2010